

Bridging Asymptotic Independence and Dependence in Spatial Extremes Using Gaussian Scale Mixtures

Raphaël Huser¹, Thomas Opitz² and Emeric Thibaud³

October 17, 2016

Abstract

Gaussian scale mixtures are constructed as Gaussian processes with a random variance. They have non-Gaussian marginals and can exhibit asymptotic dependence unlike Gaussian processes, which are asymptotically independent except in the case of perfect dependence. In this paper, we study the extremal dependence properties of Gaussian scale mixtures and provide general results on their joint tail decay rates. Motivated by the analysis of spatial extremes, we propose a flexible yet parsimonious parametric copula model that smoothly interpolates from asymptotic dependence to independence and includes the Gaussian dependence as a special case. We show how this new model can be fitted to high threshold exceedances using a censored likelihood approach, and we demonstrate that it provides valuable information about tail characteristics. Our parametric approach outperforms the widely used nonparametric χ and $\bar{\chi}$ statistics often used to guide model choice at an exploratory stage by borrowing strength across locations for better estimation of the asymptotic dependence class. We demonstrate the capacity of our methodology by adequately capturing the extremal properties of wind speed data collected in the Pacific Northwest, US.

Keywords: asymptotic dependence and independence; censored likelihood inference; spatial copula; extreme event; random scale model; threshold exceedance.

¹Computer, Electrical and Mathematical Sciences and Engineering (CEMSE) Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Thuwal 23955-6900, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: raphael.huser@kaust.edu.sa

²INRA, UR546 Biostatistics and Spatial Processes, 228, Route de l'Aérodrome, CS 40509, 84914 Avignon, France. E-mail: thomas.opitz@inra.fr

³Department of Statistics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523, U.S.A. E-mail: emeric.thibaud@colostate.edu

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Gaussian processes have been used extensively in classical spatial statistics thanks to their appealing theoretical properties, tractability in high dimensions, explicit conditional distributions and ease of simulation. However, as far as the modeling of extremes is concerned, they have been heavily criticized ([Davison *et al.*, 2013](#)) as being unable to capture asymptotic dependence; Gaussian processes are asymptotically independent, meaning that the dependence strength between events observed at two distinct spatial locations vanishes as their extremeness increases. Without firm knowledge about the tail properties of the data, it is safer (i.e., more conservative) in terms of risk of joint extremes to assume asymptotic dependence. Using Gaussian processes or other asymptotically independent processes for extrapolation beyond the range of the observations may lead to severe underestimation of joint tail probabilities. This lack of solid theoretical foundations for extrapolation has been a catalyst for extensive research in extreme-value theory (EVT).

Classical EVT provides support for the use of max-stable models for block-maxima (e.g., annual maxima of daily temperature or precipitation), because they are the only possible limits of renormalized pointwise maxima of spatial processes ([de Haan and Ferreira, 2006](#)). Their strong asymptotic justification is both a blessing and a curse: max-stability provides a robust modeling framework when few extreme data are available, but this strong assumption may be far from satisfied at subasymptotic levels arising with finite samples. An instructive example is asymptotic independence, where the limiting max-stable distribution is the product of independent margins and cannot capture the potentially strong dependence that remains at extreme subasymptotic levels. In addition to this possibly large gap between the theory and the data, inference for max-stable models is tricky. Full likelihoods can only be calculated in small dimensions, which led to the use of less efficient inference techniques, such as composite likelihoods ([Padoan *et al.*, 2010](#); [Huser and Davison, 2013](#); [Castruccio *et al.*, 2016](#)). [Thibaud *et al.* \(2016\)](#) and [Dombry *et al.* \(2016\)](#) recently showed how the

full likelihood may be approximated in Bayesian or frequentist settings by integrating out a random partition using Monte Carlo techniques; however, these approaches remain computer intensive in large dimensions. Alternatively, models for threshold exceedances based on the limiting Poisson (Wadsworth and Tawn, 2014; Engelke *et al.*, 2015) or the generalized Pareto (Ferreira and de Haan, 2014; Thibaud and Opitz, 2015) process are the counterparts of max-stable models for threshold exceedances and have become increasingly popular because they circumvent many of the computational bottlenecks of max-stable processes. However, analogous to max-stable processes, Pareto processes are threshold-stable and thus lack tail flexibility, especially when fitted to asymptotically independent data. Very extreme joint risks tend to be strongly overestimated by these models if the data exhibit decreasing dependence strength at more extreme levels.

Because of the practical limitations of ultimate models, such as max-stable or Pareto processes, it is natural to seek penultimate (i.e., subasymptotic) models for spatial extremes, which combine tail flexibility with computational tractability and have known tail characteristics, in the same vein as penultimate approximations in univariate EVT (Kaufmann, 2000). In the case of asymptotic independence, Gaussian models might be reasonable. Alternatively, Wadsworth and Tawn (2012) proposed inverted max-stable models, which were found to be slightly more flexible than Gaussian processes in some applications (Thibaud *et al.*, 2013; Davison *et al.*, 2013), but are as difficult to fit as max-stable models. A more complex Bayesian nonparametric copula model was proposed by Fuentes *et al.* (2013). Recently, Opitz (2016) advocated a very specific Gaussian scale mixture model designed for asymptotic independence, constructed from the product of a standard Gaussian process with a random variance following the exponential distribution, yielding Laplace random fields. In the case of asymptotic dependence, subasymptotic models were also developed. Wadsworth and Tawn (2012) proposed max-mixtures involving inverted max-stable and max-stable models, which add flexibility over the latter at the price of a relatively large number of parameters to be estimated. Morris *et al.* (2015) proposed a Bayesian space-time skew- t model for threshold

exceedances. [Krupskii *et al.* \(2016\)](#) proposed factor copula models constructed from Gaussian processes with a random mean, which can capture asymptotic dependence or independence.

The above spatial models are useful in many respects by introducing more flexibility or by improving computation over max-stable models, but they focus on modeling exclusively either asymptotically independent or asymptotically dependent data. Here, we propose a spatial subasymptotic model, which smoothly bridges the two asymptotic classes and allows estimating the latter from the data. In practice, this feature is highly valuable because misspecifying asymptotic dependence may lead to severe misestimation of tail probabilities ([Coles and Pauli, 2002](#)). Moreover, the model type is usually chosen a priori using the coefficients χ and $\bar{\chi}$ ([Coles *et al.*, 1999](#)), whose nonparametric estimation entails large uncertainties and does not yield a spatially coherent model. To illustrate this, [Figure 1](#) displays the nonparametric and model-based estimates of the quantities $\chi(u)$ and $\bar{\chi}(u)$ defined in [\(10\)](#) for an asymptotically independent process. The parametric estimators of $\chi(u)$ and $\bar{\chi}(u)$ are much more reliable than their nonparametric counterparts, and our approach allows borrowing strength across locations for better estimation. More details are given in [§4.2](#).

In this paper, we generalize [Opitz \(2016\)](#) by studying general Gaussian scale mixtures and proposing subasymptotic copula models for spatial threshold exceedances. Preliminaries about copulas are recalled in [§1.2](#), and the definition and properties of Gaussian scale mixture models are detailed in [§2](#). In [§3](#), we provide theoretical results on joint tail decay rates that define conditions on the random scale’s distribution for capturing asymptotic dependence or asymptotic independence. Parametric models are discussed; in particular, we propose a novel model that links the two asymptotic dependence regimes. Inference for high threshold exceedances based on a full likelihood with partial censoring is discussed in [§4.1](#), followed by a simulation study in [§4.2](#). We illustrate the suitability of our proposed model in [§5](#), where we apply it to wind speed extremes in the Pacific Northwest, US. [Section 6](#) concludes with some discussion. Proofs are deferred to the Appendix.




Figure 1: Estimated coefficients $\chi(u)$ (left) and $\bar{\chi}(u)$ (right), $u \in [0.9, 1]$, for model (2) using (17) with $\beta = \gamma = 1$ (asymptotic independent case with $\chi = 0$) and correlation function $\rho(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2) = \exp\{-\|\mathbf{s}_2 - \mathbf{s}_1\|/\lambda\}$ with $\lambda = 1$ for two points at distance $\|\mathbf{s}_2 - \mathbf{s}_1\| = 0.5$. Estimation is either nonparametric (yellow) or parametric based on $D = 5$ (red), 10 (green) or 15 (blue) uniform locations in $[0, 1]^2$. The number of replicates is $n = 1000$. Solid lines show means of 500 simulations, while shaded areas are 95% overall confidence envelopes. True curves are in black, and the threshold $v = 0.95$ used in (19) is the vertical dashed line.

1.2 Copula models

By Sklar's Theorem (Sklar, 1959), any continuous joint distribution $G(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_D)^T \in \text{Supp}(G) \subset \mathbb{R}^D$, with univariate margins $G_1, \dots, G_D$ may be uniquely represented as

$$G(\mathbf{x}) = C\{G_1(x_1), \dots, G_D(x_D)\} \iff C(\mathbf{u}) = G\{G_1^{-1}(u_1), \dots, G_D^{-1}(u_D)\}, \quad (1)$$

where $C(\mathbf{u})$, $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_D)^T \in [0, 1]^D$, is the copula, also called the dependence function.

Alternatively, a copula may be defined as a joint distribution with uniform margins on $[0, 1]$.

The interesting feature of the representation (1) is that it enables separate treatment of marginal distributions and dependence structure. Many copula families may be constructed using (1): the Gaussian copula is obtained by taking $G(\cdot) = \Phi_D(\cdot; \Sigma)$, the multivariate standard Gaussian distribution with correlation matrix Σ ; the Student- t copula is obtained by taking $G(\cdot) = T_D(\cdot; \Sigma, \text{Df})$, the multivariate Student- t distribution with correlation matrix Σ and $\text{Df} > 0$ degrees of freedom. In §2 we define Gaussian scale mixture models that are simple elliptic extensions of Gaussian processes from which flexible copula families can be derived.

2 Gaussian scale mixture processes

2.1 Definition

To create flexible spatial models, we define a Gaussian scale mixture process (i.e., a Gaussian process with random variance) as follows:

$$X(\mathbf{s}) = RW(\mathbf{s}), \quad \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (2)$$

where $W(\mathbf{s})$ is a standard Gaussian process with correlation function $\rho(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2)$, and $R \sim F(r)$ is a positive random variable, independent of $W(\mathbf{s})$, with distribution $F(r)$ and density $f(r)$ if the latter exists, which we will assume in the remainder of the paper if not stated otherwise. Conditional on R , the random process $X(\mathbf{s})$ is Gaussian with zero mean and variance R^2 . Gaussian processes arise as a special case when $R = r_0$ almost surely for some $r_0 > 0$. In this paper, we use the copula associated to (2) through (1) as a model for extremal dependence.

2.2 Finite dimensional distributions

When the process (2) is observed at D spatial locations $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_D \in \mathcal{S}$, we write $X_j = X(\mathbf{s}_j)$ and $W_j = W(\mathbf{s}_j)$, $j = 1, \dots, D$, yielding the random vectors $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_D)^T$ and $\mathbf{W} = (W_1, \dots, W_D)^T$. From (2), one has the representation

$$\mathbf{X} = R\mathbf{W}, \quad R \sim F(r) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{W} \sim \mathcal{N}_D(0, \mathbf{\Sigma}), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is a correlation matrix determined by the spatial configuration of sites. By conditioning on R , we deduce that the distribution G and density g of $\mathbf{X}$ are

$$G(\mathbf{x}) = \int_0^\infty \Phi_D(\mathbf{x}/r; \mathbf{\Sigma}) f(r) dr, \quad g(\mathbf{x}) = \int_0^\infty \phi_D(\mathbf{x}/r; \mathbf{\Sigma}) r^{-D} f(r) dr, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^D, \quad (4)$$

where $\Phi_D(\cdot; \mathbf{\Sigma})$ and $\phi_D(\cdot; \mathbf{\Sigma})$, respectively, denote the D -variate Gaussian distribution and density with zero mean and covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. Some non-trivial choices of the density $f(r)$ lead to a closed-form expression of the density $g(\mathbf{x})$, including the Student- t , Laplace and slash models (Opitz, 2016). In general, the unidimensional integrals in (4) can be

accurately approximated using numerical integration. Marginal distributions G_k and their corresponding densities g_k , $k = 1, \dots, D$, are

$$G_k(x_k) = \int_0^\infty \Phi(x_k/r) f(r) dr, \quad g_k(x_k) = \int_0^\infty \phi(x_k/r) r^{-1} f(r) dr, \quad x_k \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (5)$$

The censored likelihood defined in §4.1 requires the partial derivatives of the copula distribution and hence partial derivatives of the distribution G in (4). Let $I \subset \{1, \dots, D\}$ be a set of indices of cardinality $|I|$ corresponding to components exceeding a high threshold in §4.1, with its complement in $\{1, \dots, D\}$ denoted by I^c , and let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_D)^T \in \mathbb{R}^D$. For any sets of indices $A, B \subset \{1, \dots, D\}$, let $\mathbf{x}_A$ denote the subvector of $\mathbf{x}$ obtained by retaining the components indexed by A , let $\Sigma_{A;B}$ denote the matrix Σ restricted to the rows in A and the columns in B , and let $\Sigma_{A|B} = \Sigma_{A;A} - \Sigma_{A;B} \Sigma_{B;B}^{-1} \Sigma_{B;A}$. Differentiation of G in (4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} G_I(\mathbf{x}) &:= \frac{\partial^{|I|}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_I} G(\mathbf{x}) = \int_0^\infty \frac{\partial^{|I|}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_I} \Phi_D(\mathbf{x}/r; \Sigma) f(r) dr \\ &= \int_0^\infty \Phi_{|I^c|} \{(\mathbf{x}_{I^c} - \Sigma_{I^c;I} \Sigma_{I;I}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_I)/r; \Sigma_{I^c|I}\} \phi_{|I|}(\mathbf{x}_I/r; \Sigma_{I;I}) r^{-|I|} f(r) dr, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

which involves the conditional Gaussian distribution of $\mathbf{X}_{I^c}$ given $\mathbf{X}_I = \mathbf{x}_I/r$. The computation of G in (4) and G_I in (6) relies on the Gaussian distribution function in dimension D and $|I^c|$ respectively, which can be estimated without bias (Genz and Bretz, 2009).

2.3 Interpretation as elliptic processes

Gaussian scale mixtures (3) are elliptically contoured distributions (Cambanis *et al.*, 1981), which may be written in pseudo-polar representation as

$$\mathbf{X} \stackrel{D}{=} R^* \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{U}, \quad (7)$$

where $\Sigma = \Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma^{T/2}$ is a covariance matrix and $R^* \geq 0$ is a positive random variable, called radius, that is independent of a random vector $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \dots, U_D)^T$ uniformly distributed on the Euclidean unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^D$ (i.e., $\|\mathbf{U}\|_2 = 1$). We assume that Σ is invertible if not stated otherwise. Using elliptic theory (Cambanis *et al.*, 1981), one can equivalently rewrite

the multivariate density in (4) as

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = |\Sigma|^{-1/2} h_D(\mathbf{x}^T \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^D,$$

for some function $h_D : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. The D -variate Gaussian distribution is characterized by $h_D(t) = (2\pi)^{-D/2} \exp(-t/2)$, $t \geq 0$. A simple change of variables gives the density f_{R^*} of the radial component R^* in (7) as $f_{R^*}(r) = A_D r^{D-1} h_D(r^2)$, $r > 0$, where A_D denotes the surface area of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^D$ (i.e., $A_1 = 1$ and $A_D = 2\pi^{D/2} \{\Gamma(D/2)\}^{-1}$, $D > 1$, with the gamma function $\Gamma(\cdot)$). Because the Gaussian vector $\mathbf{W}$ in (3) is itself elliptic, the radial variable of $\mathbf{X} = R\mathbf{W}$ is $R^* = RR_{\mathbf{W}}$ with $R_{\mathbf{W}}$ distributed according to the chi-distribution with D degrees of freedom and has density $f_{R_{\mathbf{W}}}(r) = 2^{1-D/2} \{\Gamma(D/2)\}^{-1} r^{D-1} \exp(-r^2/2)$, $r > 0$. One reason that the class of Gaussian scale mixtures provides a practically relevant family of models is that under mild restrictions, it coincides with the large family of stochastic processes possessing elliptic finite-dimensional distributions (Huang and Cambanis, 1979).

2.4 Conditional distributions and simulation algorithm

Conditional simulation is crucial for spatial prediction and estimation of complex spatial functionals. For $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_1^T, \mathbf{X}_2^T)^T = R(\mathbf{W}_1^T, \mathbf{W}_2^T)^T$ a D -dimensional Gaussian scale mixture partitioned into subvectors $\mathbf{X}_1$ and $\mathbf{X}_2$ of dimensions $D_1 \in \{1, \dots, D-1\}$ and $D_2 = D - D_1$, respectively, we derive the conditional distributions of $\mathbf{X}_2$ given $\mathbf{X}_1$ and of the latent variable R given $\mathbf{X}_1$. We then use these results to propose a conditional simulation algorithm. We let $\Sigma_{i,j}$, $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, denote the corresponding blocks of the covariance matrix Σ of $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{W}_1^T, \mathbf{W}_2^T)^T$ and $\Sigma_{i|j} = \Sigma_{i,i} - \Sigma_{i,j} \Sigma_{j,j}^{-1} \Sigma_{j,i}$.

Theorem 1 (Conditional distributions). *The conditional distribution of $\mathbf{X}_2$ given $\mathbf{X}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1$ is elliptic with density*

$$f_{\mathbf{X}_2|\mathbf{X}_1=\mathbf{x}_1}(\mathbf{x}_2) = c_0^{-1} |\Sigma_{2|1}|^{-1/2} h_D \left\{ (\mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{2|1})^T \Sigma_{2|1}^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{2|1}) + c_1 \right\}, \quad \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{D_2}, \quad (8)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{2|1} = \Sigma_{2,1} \Sigma_{1,1}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_1$, $c_0 = A_{D_2} \int_0^\infty h_D(r^2 + c_1) r^{D_2-1} dr$, $c_1 = \mathbf{x}_1^T \Sigma_{1,1}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_1$ and

$$h_D(t) = A_D^{-1} t^{(1-D)/2} f_{RR_{\mathbf{W}}}(\sqrt{t}), \quad f_{RR_{\mathbf{W}}}(r) = \int_0^\infty F(s^{-1}) \{f_{R_{\mathbf{W}}}(rs) + f'_{R_{\mathbf{W}}}(rs)rs\} ds.$$

It has pseudo-polar representation $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{2|1} + R_{2|1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2|1}^{1/2}\mathbf{U}$ with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2|1} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2|1}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2|1}^{T/2}$, $\|\mathbf{U}\|_2 = 1$ and radius $R_{2|1}$ whose density is $f_{R_{2|1}}(r) = A_{D_2} c_0^{-1} r^{D_2-1} h_D(r^2 + c_1)$, $r > 0$. The conditional density of R given $\mathbf{X}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{D_1}$, with $1 \leq D_1 \leq D$, is

$$f_{R|\mathbf{X}_1=\mathbf{x}_1}(r) = r^{-D_1} f(r) \phi_{D_1}(\mathbf{x}_1/r; \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{1;1}) / g(\mathbf{x}_1), \quad r \geq 0. \quad (9)$$

Simulation of $\mathbf{X}_2$ conditional on $\mathbf{X}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1$ can be done either by directly calculating and simulating the elements of the pseudo-polar representation $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{2|1} + R_{2|1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2|1}^{1/2}\mathbf{U}$ or by exploiting the latent Gaussian structure in a two-step procedure: to simulate $R\mathbf{W}_2$ conditional to $R\mathbf{W}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1$, we first generate a realization $\tilde{r}$ of the conditional scale variable $\tilde{R}$ according to its density $f_{R|\mathbf{X}_1=\mathbf{x}_1}$ in (9), and then we sample a realization $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2$ of $\mathbf{W}_2$ conditional on $\tilde{R} = \tilde{r}$ and $\mathbf{X}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1$, i.e., we sample $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2$ according to the conditional Gaussian distribution $\mathbf{W}_2 | \mathbf{W}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1/\tilde{r}$ with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{2|1}/\tilde{r}$ and covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2|1}$. Then, $\tilde{r}\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_2$ is a realization of the conditional vector $\mathbf{X}_2$ given $\mathbf{X}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1$.

3 Tail behavior of Gaussian scale mixture models

3.1 Asymptotic independence and dependence

We characterize the bivariate joint tail decay of Gaussian scale mixtures with two commonly used coefficients χ and $\bar{\chi}$ (Coles *et al.*, 1999) defined as $\chi := \lim_{u \rightarrow 1} \chi(u)$ and $\bar{\chi} := \lim_{u \rightarrow 1} \bar{\chi}(u)$, where

$$\chi(u) = 2 - \frac{\log C(u, u)}{\log(u)}, \quad \bar{\chi}(u) = \frac{2 \log(1 - u)}{\log \bar{C}(u, u)} - 1, \quad (10)$$

and $C(u_1, u_2)$ is the bivariate copula stemming from the pair of variables $(X_1, X_2)^T$ through (1) with survival copula $\bar{C}(u_1, u_2) = 1 - u_1 - u_2 + C(u_1, u_2)$. When variables X_1 and X_2 are asymptotically dependent, then $\chi > 0$ and $\bar{\chi} = 1$. By contrast, asymptotic independence of X_1 and X_2 gives $\bar{\chi} \in [-1, 1]$ and $\chi = 0$. In practice, the pair of coefficients $\{\chi(u), \bar{\chi}(u)\}$ evaluated for increasingly large thresholds $u \in [0, 1]$ may help assess the asymptotic dependence class (Coles *et al.*, 1999); see Figure 1 for illustration.

The following results on joint tail decay rates heavily rely on specific tail dependence characterizations of elliptic distributions based on the seminal monograph of [Berman \(1992\)](#). To understand the asymptotic dependence structure entailed by the Gaussian scale mixture model (3), we fix $D = 2$ and study the asymptotic properties of $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2)^T = R(W_1, W_2)^T$, where the Gaussian vector $\mathbf{W} = (W_1, W_2)^T$ has correlation $\rho \in (-1, 1)$, excluding the degenerate cases $\rho \in \{-1, 1\}$. We first provide general results covering asymptotic dependence and asymptotic independence and then discuss useful parametric examples of distributions for R in §3.3. Asymptotic independence is obtained for the wide class of Weibull-like tail decay in R (see Theorem 2), whereas asymptotic dependence occurs when R is regularly varying at infinity, i.e., when R has Pareto-like tail behavior (see Theorem 3).

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic independence for Gaussian scale mixtures). *Suppose that*

$$\Pr(R \geq r) = 1 - F(r) \sim \alpha r^\gamma \exp(-\delta r^\beta), \quad r \rightarrow \infty, \quad (11)$$

for some constants $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta > 0$. Then $\chi = 0$ and

$$\bar{\chi} = 2 \{(1 + \rho)/2\}^{\beta/(\beta+2)} - 1.$$

The joint tail can be written as

$$\bar{C}\{1 - 1/x, 1 - 1/x\} = \mathcal{L}(x)x^{-1/\eta}, \quad x \rightarrow \infty, \quad (12)$$

where $\eta = (1 + \bar{\chi})/2$ is the coefficient of tail dependence ([Ledford and Tawn, 1996](#)), $\mathcal{L}(x) \sim K \log(x)^{(1-1/\eta)\frac{2\gamma+\beta}{2\beta}+1/(2\eta)-1}$ is a slowly varying function as $x \rightarrow \infty$ and K is a positive constant depending on α , β , γ and δ ; see Appendix B.

Theorem 3 (Asymptotic dependence for Gaussian scale mixtures). *Suppose that R is regularly varying at infinity, that is,*

$$\frac{\Pr(R \geq tr)}{\Pr(R \geq t)} = \frac{1 - F(tr)}{1 - F(t)} = r^{-\gamma}, \quad r > 0, \quad t \rightarrow \infty, \quad (13)$$

for some $\gamma > 0$. Then $\bar{\chi} = 1$ and

$$\chi = 2 \left[1 - T \left\{ (1 + \gamma)^{1/2} (1 - \rho)(1 - \rho^2)^{-1/2}; \gamma + 1 \right\} \right], \quad (14)$$

where $T(\cdot; \text{Df})$ is the univariate Student- t distribution with $\text{Df} > 0$ degrees of freedom. The joint tail can be written as

$$\overline{C}(1 - 1/x, 1 - 1/x) \sim \chi \times \Pr\{G_1(X_1) > 1 - 1/x\} \sim \chi/x, \quad x \rightarrow \infty. \quad (15)$$

We use the terms Weibull-type and Pareto-type distributions for variables R with tail representation (11) and (13), respectively. The case where R is deterministic or upper-bounded almost surely can be interpreted as a limit of (11) as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ and in this case $\overline{\chi} = \rho$. Off-diagonal decay rates are in the Supplementary Material.

3.2 Characterization of max-stable limits

To better understand the extremal dependence structure of Gaussian scale mixture processes, we recall known results on the characterization of max-stable limits in terms of convergence of finite-dimensional distributions. A stochastic process $X(\mathbf{s})$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, with common marginal distributions is in the domain of attraction of a max-stable process $Z(\mathbf{s})$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, if there exist normalizing sequences $a_n > 0$ and b_n such that for independent and identically distributed copies $X_i(\mathbf{s})$ of $X(\mathbf{s})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, one has

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, n} a_n^{-1} \{X_i(\mathbf{s}) - b_n\} \rightarrow Z(\mathbf{s}), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (16)$$

For a regularly varying scale distribution F as defined in (13) the max-stable convergence (16) holds with a non-trivial extremal- t limit process (Opitz, 2013). By contrast, if F has a Weibull-type tail as defined by (11), we obtain asymptotic independence according to Theorem 2, if the correlation function $\rho(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2)$ is strictly less than one for $\mathbf{s}_1 \neq \mathbf{s}_2$. Using Lemmas 4 and 7, the max-stable limit arising in (16) is a “white noise” limit process with Gumbel marginals. Beyond this trivial limit obtained for Weibull-type random scales, more insight can be obtained by considering triangular arrays of Gaussian scale mixtures with increasing correlation. More precisely, let $X_{i;n}(\mathbf{s}) = R_i W_{i;n}(\mathbf{s})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, denote a sequence of Gaussian scale mixtures with independent and identically distributed scale variables R_i of the Weibull type (11), and independent but non-identically distributed standard Gaussian

processes $W_{i;n}(\mathbf{s})$ independent of R_i . In analogy to (16), such a triangular array is said to be in the domain of attraction of a max-stable process $Z(\mathbf{s})$ if the convergence in (16) is satisfied with $X_i(\mathbf{s})$ substituted by $X_{i;n}(\mathbf{s})$. From Hashorva (2013, Theorem 5.1), such convergence holds for Weibull-like Gaussian scale mixtures, provided the correlation function $\rho_n(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2)$ of $W_{i;n}(\mathbf{s})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, satisfies

$$2b_n \{1 - \rho_n(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2)\} / a_n \rightarrow \omega(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2) \in (0, \infty), \quad \mathbf{s}_1 \neq \mathbf{s}_2, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\omega(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2)$ is a negative definite function; that is, $\rho_n(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2) \rightarrow 1$ at a certain rate. The corresponding max-stable limit is a Brown–Resnick process (Kablichko *et al.*, 2009), similar to standard results for Gaussian triangular arrays (Hüsler and Reiss, 1989).

3.3 Parametric models

In practice, a useful distribution for R has to be chosen when fitting a Gaussian mixture model to observed extremes. This may be guided by a preliminary assessment of asymptotic dependence using the coefficients $\chi(u)$ and $\bar{\chi}(u)$ defined in (10) although nonparametric estimates may be highly variable; recall Figure 1. We describe general parametric families that may be used to capture either asymptotic independence or asymptotic dependence and then propose a novel parsimonious model that encompasses the two dependence classes.

In the asymptotic independence case, a flexible distribution satisfying Weibull-type tail behavior as in (11) is the generalized gamma distribution with parameters $a, b, \beta > 0$, denoted by $\Gamma_\beta(a, b)$, with density

$$f(r) = \beta b^{-a} \{\Gamma(a/\beta)\}^{-1} r^{a-1} \exp\{-(r/b)^\beta\}, \quad r > 0.$$

The corresponding parameters in (11) are restricted as $\gamma > -\beta$, but it is possible to generate any value of $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ through an appropriate choice of the parameters in $\Gamma_\beta(a, b)$; see the Supplementary Material for more details. The generalized gamma distribution encompasses several well-known parametric families, including the gamma distribution ($\beta = 1$), the Weibull distribution ($a = \beta$), the exponential distribution ($a = \beta = 1$) and distributions of

the type Nakagami, Rayleigh, chi, chi-squared, half-normal and the log-normal distribution as a limit when $\beta \downarrow 0$, $a/\beta \uparrow \infty$ and $b \uparrow \infty$ in a specific way (see [Forbes et al., 2011](#), p. 113). A Rayleigh-distributed random scale R yields Laplace random fields $X(\mathbf{s})$ with explicit joint densities $g(\mathbf{x})$ in (4) and a certain type of univariate generalized Pareto tails ([Opitz, 2016](#)).

Asymptotic dependent models are obtained from a regularly varying random scale R . One possibility is to choose the distribution of R^2 as the inverse-gamma distribution with parameters $1/2$ and $\text{Df}/2$, yielding Student- t random fields with $\text{Df} > 0$ degrees of freedom ([Røislien and Omre, 2006](#); [Demarta and McNeil, 2005](#)). When R is Pareto distributed, the Gaussian scale mixture has multivariate slash densities available in closed form, albeit in terms of the incomplete gamma function ([Wang and Genton, 2006](#)).

When modeling dependence in spatial extremes, fixing the type of asymptotic behavior has important consequences on the estimation of return levels for spatial functionals. Preliminary assessment of asymptotic (in)dependence using empirical $\chi(u)$ and $\bar{\chi}(u)$ statistics may be awkward especially with small sample sizes as uncertainties become increasingly large as $u \rightarrow 1$; recall Figure 1. Thus, it is highly valuable to fit flexible models encompassing both asymptotic dependence and asymptotic independence regimes in order to borrow strength across all stations for efficient estimation of tail properties from the data. As Gaussian processes have been widely applied and advocated in spatial statistics, it is useful to have the Gaussian dependence structure as a special case. Gaussian models may provide an appropriate description of the dependence in some applications, and it is always instructive to assess how far the fitted dependence model is from Gaussianity. Here, we propose a new flexible model for the random scale variable R defined as a two-parameter Weibull-type distribution with support $[1, \infty)$, containing the Dirac mass at 1 as limiting case, yielding asymptotically independent standard Gaussian processes, and the Pareto distribution as boundary case, yielding asymptotic dependence; recall Theorem 3. Its distribution with parameters $\beta \geq 0, \gamma > 0$ is defined as

$$F(r) = \begin{cases} 1 - \exp\{-\gamma(r^\beta - 1)/\beta\}, & \beta > 0, \\ 1 - r^{-\gamma}, & \beta = 0, \end{cases} \quad r \geq 1. \quad (17)$$

The distribution (17) forms a continuous parametric family with respect to β as the term $(r^\beta - 1)/\beta$ in the exponent converges to $\log r$ as $\beta \downarrow 0$. The type of asymptotic dependence is determined by the value of β . When $\beta > 0$, (17) coincides with the tail representation (11) with the same tail parameter β , yielding asymptotic independence. When $\beta = 0$ or $\beta \downarrow 0$, the variable R is Pareto distributed with $F(r) = 1 - r^{-\gamma}$, $r \geq 1$, yielding asymptotic dependence. The Dirac mass at 1 is obtained as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ or as $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$.

Figure 2 shows the coefficients $\chi(u)$ and $\bar{\chi}(u)$ as a function of the threshold $u \in [0.9, 1]$ for various parameters β, γ in (17) and correlation ρ of $(W_1, W_2)^T$. The plots illustrate the ability of the model in (17) to smoothly interpolate from asymptotic independence to asymptotic dependence. To contrast the flexibility of our model (17) with respect to the Gaussian copula, we also display $\chi(u)$ and $\bar{\chi}(u)$ for the Gaussian copula, whose correlation coefficient is chosen such that these coefficients for the two models match at the level $u = 0.95$. Significant differences appear between the Gaussian copula and model (17) when $\beta, \gamma \leq 1$, especially for $u \approx 1$. When β or γ increases, our model approaches the Gaussian copula although the limit quantities $\bar{\chi}$ may still be quite different for moderate values of β or γ . The extra tail flexibility of our model compared to the Gaussian copula is apparent when we vary the parameters β and γ . The differences in joint tail decay rates with respect to the Gaussian copula are even more evident in higher dimensions.

4 Likelihood inference

4.1 Maximum likelihood approach with partial censoring

To estimate the extremal dependence structure from the observed high spatial threshold exceedances, we advocate a two-step procedure: marginal distributions are estimated non-parametrically based on ranks and then copula parameters are estimated using a full pseudo-likelihood with partial censoring preventing estimates from being influenced by low and moderate values. This censored approach is now quite popular in statistics of extremes (see, e.g., Thibaud *et al.*, 2013; Huser and Davison, 2014; Wadsworth and Tawn, 2014) and results




Figure 2: Coefficients $\chi(u)$ (top) and $\bar{\chi}(u)$ (bottom), $u \in [0.9, 1]$, for model (17) (solid black) and for the Gaussian copula matching at $u = 0.95$ (dashed red). Parameter configurations are $\beta = 0, \gamma = 1$ (left), $\beta = 1, \gamma = 1$ (middle), $\beta = 5, \gamma = 1$ (right). Thin to thick curves correspond to increasing correlations $\rho = 0, 0.3, 0.6, 0.9$ for model (17). Limit quantities χ and $\bar{\chi}$ are represented by dots at $u = 1$. The left column displays an asymptotic dependent scenario, while the middle and right columns display asymptotic independence.

from Thibaud and Opitz (2015) and Huser *et al.* (2016) suggest it provides a reasonable compromise between bias and variance compared to alternatives.

Let $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{1i}, \dots, Y_{Di})^T$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, denote n independent and identically distributed observations from a process $Y(\mathbf{s})$ at the stations $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_D \in \mathcal{S}$. We assume that in the joint tail region corresponding to large values of $Y_{1i}, \dots, Y_{Di}$, the vectors $\mathbf{Y}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are well described by a continuous joint distribution H with margins $H_1, \dots, H_D$ and copula C stemming from a Gaussian scale mixture (2).

Since we focus on the extremal dependence structure, we estimate marginal distributions $H_1, \dots, H_D$ in a first step using empirical distribution functions. Defining $\hat{H}_k(y) = (n+1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n I(Y_{ki} \leq y)$ with the indicator function $I(\cdot)$, we transform the data to a pseudo-uniform scale as

$$U_{ki} := \hat{H}_k(Y_{ki}) = \frac{\text{rank}(Y_{ki})}{n+1}, \quad k = 1, \dots, D, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (18)$$

where $\text{rank}(Y_{ki})$ is the rank of Y_{ki} among the variables $Y_{k1}, \dots, Y_{kn}$. The denominator $(n+1)$ in (18) ensures that transformed variables U_{ki} , $k = 1, \dots, D$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are within $(0, 1)$. Since $\widehat{H}_k$ is a consistent estimator of H_k for each component $k = 1, \dots, D$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the variables $U_{k1}, \dots, U_{kn}$ form an approximate uniform $\text{Unif}(0, 1)$ random sample for large n . The nonparametric estimator (18) may not be very good for the most extreme values very close to 1, but it is very robust and its bias is of the order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$. We have verified through simulations that it yields reasonable results, even for moderate values of n ; see §4.2.

In the second step, we assume that the transformed variables $U_{k1}, \dots, U_{kn}$, $k = 1, \dots, D$, are perfect random samples from the $\text{Unif}(0, 1)$ distribution, and we fit the copula (1) stemming from (2) (e.g., based on our model (17)) by maximum likelihood, censoring values not exceeding marginal thresholds $v_1, \dots, v_D \in (0, 1)$. Let $C(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\psi})$ and $c(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\psi})$ respectively denote the chosen parametric copula family and its density, where $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \Psi \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ is the unknown vector of parameters to be estimated. The thresholds v_k , $k = 1, \dots, D$, are usually chosen such that $1 - v_k$ is a low exceedance probability like 0.05 or 0.01. For each independent temporal replicate $i = 1, \dots, n$, the vector $\mathbf{U}_i = (U_{1i}, \dots, U_{Di})^T$ is either below, above or partially above the threshold $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_D)^T$, leading to different censored likelihood contributions. We adopt the lowercase notation $\mathbf{u}_i = (u_{1i}, \dots, u_{Di})^T$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, for the realized values of $\mathbf{U}_i$ and write $\mathbf{u}_i^* = \{\max(u_{1i}, v_1), \dots, \max(u_{Di}, v_D)\}^T$. Three distinct scenarios can occur:

1. if all components of the vector $\mathbf{u}_i$ are below the threshold $\mathbf{v}$ (i.e., $\mathbf{u}_i^* = \mathbf{v}$), we use the fully censored likelihood contribution

$$L(\mathbf{u}_i; \boldsymbol{\psi}) = C(\mathbf{u}_i^*; \boldsymbol{\psi}) = C(\mathbf{v}; \boldsymbol{\psi}) = G\{G_1^{-1}(v_1), \dots, G_D^{-1}(v_D)\}.$$

2. if all components of the vector $\mathbf{u}_i$ are above the threshold $\mathbf{v}$ (i.e., $\mathbf{u}_i^* = \mathbf{u}_i$), we use the uncensored contribution

$$L(\mathbf{u}_i; \boldsymbol{\psi}) = c(\mathbf{u}_i^*; \boldsymbol{\psi}) = c(\mathbf{u}_i; \boldsymbol{\psi}) = \frac{g\{G_1^{-1}(u_{1i}), \dots, G_D^{-1}(u_{Di})\}}{\prod_{k=1}^D g_k\{G_k^{-1}(u_{ki})\}}.$$

3. if some but not all components of the vector $\mathbf{u}_i$ are above the threshold $\mathbf{v}$ (indexed by the set $I_i \subset \{1, \dots, D\}$ with complement $I_i^c \subset \{1, \dots, D\}$), we use the partially

censored likelihood contribution

$$L(\mathbf{u}_i; \boldsymbol{\psi}) = C_{I_i}(\mathbf{u}_i^*; \boldsymbol{\psi}) = \int_{\mathbf{0}}^{v_{I_i^c}} c(\mathbf{u}_i; \boldsymbol{\psi}) d\mathbf{u}_{i_{I_i^c}} = \frac{G_{I_i}\{G_1^{-1}(u_{1i}^*), \dots, G_D^{-1}(u_{Di}^*)\}}{\prod_{k \in I_i} g_k\{G_k^{-1}(u_{ki}^*)\}}.$$

In the above expressions, the joint distribution G and density g , the marginal distributions G_k and densities g_k , $k = 1, \dots, D$ and the partial derivatives G_{I_i} are given by (4), (5) and (6) respectively. Our censored log likelihood is defined as the sum of all individual log contributions, that is,

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log\{L(\mathbf{u}_i; \boldsymbol{\psi})\}. \quad (19)$$

The maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$, obtained by maximizing (19) over Ψ , is a full likelihood estimator for the censored observations $\mathbf{U}_i^* = \max(\mathbf{U}_i, \mathbf{v})$ augmented by the indicator variables $I(U_{ki} \leq v_k)$, $k = 1, \dots, D$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. If the copula C is well specified and if the marginal estimation performed in the first step is perfect such that the transformed observations $\mathbf{U}_i$ are perfectly uniform, the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ obeys classical likelihood theory: as $n \rightarrow \infty$, it is strongly consistent, asymptotically normal, attains the Cramér–Rao bound and converges at rate $\mathcal{O}(n^{1/2})$ under well-known regularity conditions. With our model (17), the case $\beta = 0$ is nonstandard as it lies on the boundary of the parameter space and must be treated separately. Moreover, the nonparametric transformation in (18) results in a slight asymptotically vanishing marginal misspecification for finite n . Despite this issue, Genest *et al.* (1995) show that under mild conditions, the maximum pseudo-likelihood estimator has similar asymptotic properties to the MLE, although with a slight loss in efficiency.

4.2 Simulation study

To assess the performance of the maximum pseudo-likelihood estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ defined through (19), we simulate $n = 1000$ independent copies of the Gaussian scale mixture $X(\mathbf{s}) = RW(\mathbf{s})$ defined in (2) using our random scale model (17) at $D = 5, 10, 15$ locations $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_D$ uniformly generated in $\mathcal{S} = [0, 1]^2$. For the Gaussian process $W(\mathbf{s})$, we choose a stationary isotropic correlation function $\rho(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2) = \exp\{-(\|\mathbf{s}_1 - \mathbf{s}_2\|/\lambda)^\nu\}$ with range parameter

	100 × B		100 × SD		100 × RMSE	
	$\lambda = 0.5$	$\lambda = 1$	$\lambda = 0.5$	$\lambda = 1$	$\lambda = 0.5$	$\lambda = 1$
$\beta = 0$	4/5/8/11	12/7/11/19	9/7/8/23	19/6/10/27	10/9/12/25	22/9/15/33
$\beta = 0.5$	4/2/8/25	15/4/3/24	10/7/23/51	25/5/31/73	11/7/24/57	29/7/31/77
$\beta = 1$	5/2/27/64	14/3/18/58	10/6/44/97	23/5/53/108	11/7/51/116	27/6/56/123

Table 1: Bias (B), standard deviation (SD) and root mean squared error (RMSE) of estimated parameters $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = (\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\nu}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma})^T$ for the Gaussian scale mixture model (2) using (17) with correlation function $\rho(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2) = \exp\{-(\|\mathbf{s}_1 - \mathbf{s}_2\|/\lambda)^\nu\}$ and parameters $\beta = 0, 0.5, 1$, $\gamma = 1$, $\lambda = 0.5, 1$ and $\nu = 1$. Simulations are based on $n = 1000$ independent replicates observed at $D = 15$ uniform locations in $[0, 1]^2$. Maximum likelihood estimation is based on (19) with threshold $\mathbf{v} = (v, \dots, v)^T$, $v = 0.95$. Results stem from 500 independent experiments.




Figure 3: Boxplots of estimated parameters $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = (\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\nu}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma})^T$ for the Gaussian scale mixture model (2) using (17) with correlation function $\rho(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2) = \exp\{-(\|\mathbf{s}_1 - \mathbf{s}_2\|/\lambda)^\nu\}$ and parameters $\lambda = \nu = \beta = \gamma = 1$. Simulations are based on $n = 1000$ independent replicates observed at $D = 5, 10, 15$ uniform locations in $[0, 1]^2$. Maximum likelihood estimation is based on (19) with threshold $\mathbf{v} = (v, \dots, v)^T$, $v = 0.95$. Boxplots are produced from 500 independent experiments. Red points/horizontal lines show the estimated means/true values.

$\lambda = 0.5, 1$ and smoothness parameter $\nu = 1$. Sample paths of $X(\mathbf{s})$ are thus continuous but nondifferentiable. For the random scale variable R , we consider three scenarios: setting $\gamma = 1$, we choose $\beta = 0$ (asymptotic dependence) or $\beta = 0.5, 1$ (asymptotic independence). We then estimate all copula parameters $\boldsymbol{\psi} = (\lambda, \nu, \beta, \gamma)^T \in \Psi = (0, \infty) \times (0, 2] \times [0, \infty) \times (0, \infty)$ by maximizing the censored pseudo-likelihood (19) using marginal thresholds $\mathbf{v} = (v, \dots, v)^T$ with $v = 0.95$. This yields $n(1 - v) = 50$ exceedances at each location, occurring simultaneously or not depending on the extremal dependence strength. We repeat this experiment 500 times to obtain boxplots of estimated parameters and compute simple performance metrics. Computational details are described in the Supplementary Material.

Table 1 reports the absolute bias (B), standard deviation (SD) and root mean squared error ($\text{RMSE} = (\text{B}^2 + \text{SD}^2)^{1/2}$) of estimated parameters for $D = 15$ based on the 500 experiments. Figure 3 displays boxplots of estimated parameters for $\lambda = \nu = \beta = \gamma = 1$ as a function of the dimension $D = 5, 10, 15$. Generally, the estimation procedure appears to work well although the variability of estimates is relatively large owing to the fairly low number of exceedances considered in this simulation setting. The bias is almost always dominated by the standard deviation but not by much. The root mean squared error indicates that parameters seem overall easier to estimate for lower values of β and λ . Indeed, when β increases, the parameters β and γ are more complicated to identify because the resulting copula converges to the Gaussian copula as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ or $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$, resulting in higher standard deviations and biases. Overall, standard deviations seem to decrease slightly as the dimension D increases, even though ψ is not a consistent estimator for model (2) under infill asymptotics. The improvement is most striking for the smoothness parameter ν , which is difficult to estimate with few scattered locations but is not clear for γ . The slightly increasing bias for larger D is due to the nonparametric marginal estimation in (18) as n is kept fixed here, but it vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Figure 1 displays estimated $\chi(u)$ and $\bar{\chi}(u)$ coefficients in (10) when $\lambda = \nu = \beta = \gamma = 1$ based either on simple nonparametric estimators or on our parametric censored likelihood approach with $D = 5, 10, 15$ locations. From these plots, it is clear that the extremal dependence structure is well estimated, and that the rate of tail decay is relatively well captured. In contrast with nonparametric estimators, the model-based estimates have largely reduced uncertainties especially for large thresholds v and borrow strength across locations for better tail estimation; hence they provide higher confidence about the asymptotic dependence class. Similar results were obtained with other parameter combinations under asymptotic independence ($\beta > 0$) or dependence ($\beta = 0$).

To investigate the tail flexibility of our model, we consider a misspecified setting. We simulate Student- t random processes with $\text{Df} = 1, 2, 5, 10$ degrees of freedom using the same correlation function, and we fit the Gaussian scale mixture (2) based on our model (17). Both




Figure 4: Estimated coefficients $\chi(u)$ (left) and $\bar{\chi}(u)$ (right), $u \in [0.9, 1]$, for data simulated from a Student- t process with $Df = 10$ degrees of freedom and correlation function $\rho(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2) = \exp\{-(\|\mathbf{s}_2 - \mathbf{s}_1\|/\lambda)^\nu\}$ with $\lambda = 0.5$ and $\nu = 1$ for two points at distance $\|\mathbf{s}_2 - \mathbf{s}_1\| = 0.5$. Estimation is either nonparametric (yellow) or parametric based on the (misspecified) Gaussian scale mixture model (2) with random scale (17), using $D = 5$ (red), 10 (green) or 15 (blue) uniform locations in $[0, 1]^2$. The number of replicates is $n = 1000$. Solid lines show means of 500 simulations, while shaded areas are 95% overall confidence envelopes. True curves are in solid black, and the threshold $v = 0.95$ used in (19) is the vertical dashed line.

models are Gaussian scale mixtures although they are not nested in each other. However, the joint tail behavior of a Student- t process with Df degrees of freedom can be considered to be close to that of the Gaussian scale mixture model (17) with $\beta = 0$ and $\gamma = Df$ because the two models have the same limiting max-stable dependence structure. Our model should therefore provide a reasonable approximation although asymptotic dependence is a boundary case. Boxplots of estimated parameters (see Supplementary Material) suggest that when $Df = 1, 2$, the performance of the MLE $\hat{\psi}$ is similar to that obtained in a well-specified setting. When $Df = 5, 10$, estimates of λ and γ are more “biased,” but the extremal dependence structure is still very well captured, as illustrated by estimated $\chi(u)$ and $\bar{\chi}(u)$ coefficients in Figure 4. In summary, our Gaussian scale mixture model provides a very flexible tail-dependent structure described by a relatively small number of parameters and can be consistently estimated from high threshold exceedances using a full pseudo-likelihood approach with partial censoring but remains fairly computer intensive for large dimensions.




Figure 5: *Left*: Topographic map with meteorological towers selected in our study and state boundaries (black). The ellipses overlaid, centered at Goodnoe Hills (GDH), correspond to the isocontours of the fitted coefficients $\chi(u) = 0.5, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2$ (from the center outward) using the thresholds $u = 0.97$ (red) and $u = 0.99$ (blue), for the best anisotropic model. *Right*: Wind rose of winter (DJF) wind speeds for the 12 stations, preliminarily transformed to the uniform scale. The color scale corresponds to different marginal quantile ranges.

5 Application

To demonstrate the flexibility of our model (17), we applied it to hourly wind speed extremes recorded during 2012–2014 in the Pacific Northwest, US, a region with large wind energy resources. The dataset was compiled from data archived by the Bonneville Power Administration. Data are available year-round at 20 meteorological towers along the border between Oregon and Washington. To avoid modeling complex spatio-temporal non-stationary patterns, we restrict our attention to winter months (DJF) for the 12 stations located on the East side of the Rocky Mountains; see Figure 5. Selected data comprise up to 6504 hourly observations at each site, with about 8% of values missing. Owing to important East-West pressure gradients in this region and the special nature of the orography, wind patterns are mainly characterized by easterly and westerly winds (Kazor and Hering, 2015). A wind rose for the data at the 12 stations reveals that extreme winds blow mostly from the West or South-West, suggesting that simple anisotropic models might perform well; see Figure 5. More details about data and monitoring stations are in the Supplementary Material.

Hourly wind speeds show strong temporal dependence. Since our focus is on spatial dependence, we ignore temporal dependence for parameter estimation but account for it in

uncertainty assessment using a block bootstrap. We consider three model classes:

1. RW: Our new Gaussian scale mixture copula model defined through (2) and (17), with underlying anisotropic correlation function $\rho(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2) = \exp\{-(h_{12}/\lambda)^\nu\}$, where h_{12} denotes the scaled Mahalanobis distance, that is,

$$h_{12}^2 = (\mathbf{s}_1 - \mathbf{s}_2)^T \Omega^{-1} (\mathbf{s}_1 - \mathbf{s}_2), \quad \Omega = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta) & -\sin(\theta) \\ \sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_{12}^{-2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta) & -\sin(\theta) \\ \sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \end{pmatrix}^T.$$

The Mahalanobis distance defines elliptical isocontours; λ and λ_{12} are respectively the length of one principal axis and the length ratio of the two principal axes, while θ is the angle with respect to the West-East direction. When $\lambda_{12} = 1$, the model is isotropic.

2. t : The Student- t copula with $\text{Df} = 1, \dots, 30$ degrees of freedom and the same anisotropic correlation function $\rho(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2)$.
3. Gauss: The Gaussian copula (same as 2., but with $\text{Df} = \infty$ fixed).

Eight models, summarized in the Supplementary Material, were fitted to the wind data using the censored likelihood estimator with threshold $\mathbf{v} = (v, \dots, v)$, $v = 0.95$; see §4.1. This yields about $6504 \times 0.05 \approx 325$ correlated exceedances at each site. The log profile censored likelihood of the (an)isotropic Student- t copula is shown in Figure 6 and compared to the maximized log likelihoods of the (an)isotropic Gaussian scale mixture and Gaussian copula. Deviances are not straightforward to interpret owing to temporal dependence, but anisotropic models seem to outperform isotropic models by a large margin. This is not surprising given the wind patterns in the study region. Moreover, the best Student- t model has $\text{Df} = 13$ degrees of freedom, a result that is consistent for isotropic and anisotropic models. This suggests that the asymptotic dependence strength is quite weak although the asymptotically independent Gaussian copula model is outperformed by the extra flexibility of the Student- t copula. The best model overall seems to be the unrestricted anisotropic Gaussian scale mixture copula (with $\beta \geq 0$) although the improvement over the best Student- t model and the restricted Gaussian scale mixture model with $\beta = 0$ looks mild; the difference in log




Figure 6: *Left*: Negative log profile censored likelihood for the Student- t copula with Df degrees of freedom (black), and negative maximized log censored likelihood for the Gaussian scale mixture copula with $\beta \geq 0$ (blue) and $\beta = 0$ (red). The Gaussian copula corresponds to Df = ∞ . Isotropic and anisotropic models correspond to thin and thick lines, respectively. The best log likelihood value has been subtracted from all curves. The vertical grey line at Df = 13 represents the best Student- t model. *Right*: Estimated probability $\Pr(U_1 > u | U_2 > u)$, as a function of the threshold u , with U_1, U_2 representing the hourly wind speed data at Goodnow Hills (GDH) and Augspurger (AUG), preliminarily transformed to the uniform scale. Different lines display the empirical estimate (yellow), and the fitted curves for the anisotropic unrestricted RW (red), restricted RW with $\beta = 0$ (green), the Student- t with Df = 13 (purple) and Gaussian (blue) models. 95% overall confidence envelopes are shown for the empirical, unrestricted RW and Gaussian fits (using similar colors). Similar envelopes were obtained for the other models but are omitted here for readability.

Table 2: Estimated parameters $\hat{\psi} = (\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\lambda}_{12}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\nu}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma})^T$ for the unrestricted anisotropic Gaussian scale mixture copula model with corresponding 95%-confidence intervals (CIs).

Parameters	λ [km]	λ_{12}	θ [rad]	ν	β	γ
Estimates	287	3.71	0.23	0.46	1.96	0.05
95%-CIs	[95, 1127]	[2.64, 5.08]	[0.18, 0.34]	[0.32, 0.76]	[0.96, 8.47]	[0, 0.32]

likelihoods is only about 7 and 9, respectively. Estimated parameters for our best model, with 95%-confidence intervals computed using a weekly block bootstrap with 100 replicates respecting the missing value patterns are reported in Table 2.

The estimate $\hat{\lambda}_{12} = 3.71$ implies that the anisotropy is fairly strong, and $\hat{\theta} = 0.23$ indicates that the direction of strongest correlation is toward the North-East, as illustrated by the

isocontours of the fitted coefficient $\chi(u)$, overlaid on the left panel of Figure 5. This agrees with the wind rose, although the wind directions were not used in the fitting procedure. The value $\hat{\nu} = 0.46$ indicates that the hourly wind field shows small scale variability, as expected. The estimates $\hat{\beta} = 1.96$ and $\hat{\gamma} = 0.05$ for the random scale parameters quite strongly support the assumption of asymptotic independence, given that the confidence interval for β excludes zero by far. However, the values of $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\gamma}$ also suggest that the extremal dependence structure is relatively far from being Gaussian, and that our model better captures the data's extremal properties. To further validate our fitted models, the right panel of Figure 6 shows the estimated probability $\Pr(U_1 > u \mid U_2 > u)$, which is more easily interpretable than $\chi(u)$ yet asymptotically equivalent as $u \rightarrow 1$, plotted as a function of the threshold $u \in [0.9, 1]$, where U_1 and U_2 represent the hourly wind speed data at Goodnow Hills (GDH) and Augspurgen (AUG), preliminarily transformed to the uniform scale. This plot suggests that all models perform reasonably well at observed levels but that the assumption of asymptotic dependence (Student- t and RW models with $\beta = 0$) or asymptotic independence (Gaussian and RW models with $\beta > 0$) implies very different predicted behaviors for very large extremes with $u \rightarrow 1$. This figure also clearly demonstrates that our model-based approach allows for a considerable reduction in the uncertainty compared to a fully nonparametric approach.

6 Discussion

Starting with a detailed study of the tail behavior of general Gaussian scale mixtures, we have proposed a new parsimonious and flexible subasymptotic copula model characterized by a smooth transition from asymptotic independence to asymptotic dependence. Unlike approaches often used in multivariate analysis confronting the asymptotically dependent Student- t model and the asymptotically independent Gaussian model, our approach puts strong focus on appropriately capturing the tail decay in asymptotic independent scenarios while keeping a flexible asymptotically dependent model on the boundary of the parameter space. Although our main contributions in this paper concern tail characteristics of Gaussian

scale mixtures and their estimation, these elliptic copula models may also be useful for the modeling of the full data range, arising in a much wider spectrum of applications.

In addition to providing more flexibility than max-stable models, inference for our model is also facilitated and may be performed using a censored pseudo-likelihood, although the latter is expressed in terms of integrals whose numerical approximation is quite intensive to compute. Overall, computations are of the same order as for the censored Poisson and Pareto likelihoods advocated by [Wadsworth and Tawn \(2014\)](#) and [Thibaud and Opitz \(2015\)](#), which are only valid for asymptotically dependent data. Our model based on (2) and (17) is closely related to the elliptic Pareto process of [Thibaud and Opitz \(2015\)](#) when $\beta = 0$ (asymptotic dependent case) or to the Laplace model of [Opitz \(2016\)](#) when $\beta > 0$ (asymptotic independence case) but estimating the value of β allows the data to provide evidence about the asymptotic dependence class without fixing it a priori. Formal hypothesis tests for $\beta = 0$ might be designed using a non-standard likelihood ratio test. To circumvent difficulties arising with non-standard likelihood inference under asymptotic dependence, a natural extension would be to design models with a transition between asymptotic independence and dependence in the interior of the parameter space. One possibility is to choose a random scale R with distribution

$$F(r) = \begin{cases} 1 - r^\beta \exp\{-(r^\beta - 1)/\beta\}, & \beta \neq 0, \\ 1 - r^{-1}, & \beta = 0, \end{cases} \quad r \geq r_\beta^*,$$

whose lower endpoint is $1 \leq r_\beta^* < 2$ depending on the parameter $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. This model is closely related to our proposal in (17) and is also more parsimonious; however, it may be more tricky to handle computationally as its support depends on β .

Our partially censored likelihood approach transcribes the common idea in statistics of extremes that only observations in the tail should be used to determine the extremal dependence structure. It would of course be possible to use milder assumptions that yield faster estimation procedures, for example by using the full uncensored density when the observation vector is a partial exceedance of the multivariate threshold or by using robust moment estimators based on ranks and bivariate tail characteristics as proposed in [Einmahl](#)

et al. (2016) for max-stable models to avoid costly high-dimensional numerical integration.

Our application demonstrates that our new model can be useful in practice. Analyzing hourly wind speed data in the Pacific Northwest, US, we found quite strong evidence of asymptotic independence, and we showed that the extremal dependence structure was well captured by our copula model (17). Over large regions, a limitation of our model arises for $\beta = 0$ (asymptotic dependence) because complete extremal independence cannot be captured at large distances, as $\chi > 0$ in (14) for any spatial lag. To circumvent this issue, our model could be extended by considering a random partitioning approach (Morris *et al.*, 2015) or a random set element (Huser and Davison, 2014) but inference would become awkward. Modeling of non-stationarity (Huser and Genton, 2016) and space-time dependence (Huser and Davison, 2014) is an important aspect in statistics of extremes; it would be interesting to investigate useful extensions of Gaussian scale mixture models in further research.

Acknowledgments

We thank Amanda Hering (Baylor University) for sharing the wind data and Luigi Lombardo (KAUST) for cartographic support. Emeric Thibaud was partially supported by US National Science Foundation Grant DMS-1243102.

Appendix

A Lemmas

For a self-contained presentation, we gather important results mainly from the existing literature, unifying notation and adapting them to the requirements for our main proofs.

Lemma 4 (Gumbel domain of attraction; Hashorva, 2006, 2010). *For a random variable $X \sim F_X$ with infinite upper endpoint, suppose that a weight function $w(\cdot) > 0$ satisfies*

$$\frac{1 - F_X\{u + x/w(u)\}}{1 - F_X(u)} \rightarrow \exp(-x), \quad u \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then F_X is in the maximum domain of attraction of the unit Gumbel distribution, that is

$$F_X^n(a_n x + b_n) \rightarrow \exp\{-\exp(-x)\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (20)$$

where we can choose $b_n = F^{-1}(1 - 1/n)$ and $a_n = 1/w(b_n)$ for $n > 1$. If X has Weibull-type tail decay with parameters as in (11), then (20) holds and we may take

$$w(u) \sim \delta \beta u^{\beta-1}, \quad u \rightarrow \infty. \quad (21)$$

Lemma 5 (Joint tail decay for Weibull-type random scale; Hashorva, 2010). Assume that the bivariate elliptic random vector $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2)^T \stackrel{D}{=} R \Sigma^{1/2} (U_1, U_2)^T$ with correlation matrix Σ , $\rho = \Sigma_{1;2} \in (-1, 1)$, has radial distribution $R \sim F$ in the Gumbel domain of attraction with weight function $w(\cdot)$ as in (21) and with copula C . Then

$$\frac{\overline{C}(1 - x_1/u, 1 - x_2/u)}{\overline{C}(1 - 1/u, 1 - 1/u)} \rightarrow (x_1 x_2)^{1/(2\eta)}, \quad \eta = \{(1 + \rho)/2\}^{\beta/2}, \quad u \rightarrow \infty, \quad (22)$$

where η is the coefficient of tail dependence of $\mathbf{X}$. More specifically, if R has Weibull-type tail with parameters as in (11), then

$$\overline{C}(1 - 1/x, 1 - 1/x) \sim K_1 (\log x)^{K_2} x^{-1/\eta}, \quad x \rightarrow \infty, \quad (23)$$

$$K_1 = \alpha^{-1} (1 - \rho)^{-2} \{2/(1 + \rho)\}^{\gamma/2 - \beta/2 + 1} (1 - \rho^2)^{3/2} \delta^{(1/\eta - 1)\gamma/\beta} \{\alpha^2/(2\pi\beta)\}^{1 - 1/(2\eta)},$$

$$K_2 = (1 - 1/\eta)\gamma/\beta + 1/(2\eta) - 1.$$

Lemma 6 (Tail decay of products of Weibull-type variables; Arendarczyk and Debicki, 2011). If two independent random variables R_1 and R_2 have Weibull-type tails such that

$$\Pr(R_i \geq r) \sim \alpha_i r^{\gamma_i} \exp(-\delta_i r^{\beta_i}), \quad r \rightarrow \infty, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where $\alpha_i > 0$, $\beta_i > 0$, $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $\delta_i > 0$ for $i = 1, 2$, then, as $r \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\Pr(R_1 R_2 \geq r) \sim \sqrt{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{\beta_2 \delta_2}{\beta_1 + \beta_2}} \alpha_1 \alpha_2 A^{0.5\beta_2 + \gamma_2 - \gamma_1} r^{\frac{2\beta_2 \gamma_1 + 2\beta_1 \gamma_2 + \beta_1 \beta_2}{2(\beta_1 + \beta_2)}} \exp\left(-B r^{\frac{\beta_1 \beta_2}{\beta_1 + \beta_2}}\right), \quad (24)$$

where $A = \{(\beta_1 \delta_1)/(\beta_2 \delta_2)\}^{1/(\beta_1 + \beta_2)}$, $B = \delta_1^{1-a} \delta_2^a \{(\beta_2/\beta_1)^a + (\beta_1/\beta_2)^{1-a}\}$ and $a = \beta_1/(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$.

Lemma 7 (Tails of elliptic distributions with a Weibull-type radius). *If the radius R in the pseudo-polar representation $R\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{U}$ of an elliptic random vector $\mathbf{X}$ has Weibull-type tail as in (11), then its components X_i , $i = 1, \dots, D$, have Weibull-type tails with the same parameter β in (11).*

Proof. Without loss of generality, consider $i = 1$. We have $X_1 \stackrel{D}{=} \sqrt{\sigma_{11}}RU_1$ with $U_1^2 \sim \text{Beta}\{1/2, (D-1)/2\}$, see Cambanis *et al.* (1981, Lemma 2). The tail representation (11) is stable under power transformations of variables like $R \mapsto R^p$, $p \in (0, \infty)$, where some of the parameters in (11) are different for the transformed variable R^p . We can fix $p = 2$ and apply Theorem 4.1 of Hashorva and Pakes (2010) to X_1^2 and R^2 , which provides results concerning the random scaling with a Beta-distributed variable. Indeed, X_1^2 is Weibull-tailed if R^2 is so, and X_1^2 and R^2 have the same weight function $w(\cdot)$ in (21) and therefore the same parameter β . Switching back to $|X_1|$ and R using $p = 1/2$ and taking into account the symmetry of X_1 with respect to 0 then proves the statement of the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 8 (Breiman's lemma; Breiman, 1965). *Assume that R is a random variable whose distribution is regularly varying at infinity with index $\gamma > 0$,*

$$\Pr(R > tr)/\Pr(R > t) \rightarrow r^{-\gamma}, \quad t \rightarrow \infty.$$

If a random variable $X \geq 0$ is independent of R and $\mathbb{E}(X^{\gamma+\varepsilon}) < \infty$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then

$$\Pr(RX > x) \sim \Pr(R > x) \mathbb{E}(X^\gamma), \quad x \rightarrow \infty.$$

B Proofs

Proof of Theorem 1. The formulas for conditional elliptic distributions follow from the related standard theory (Cambanis *et al.*, 1981, Corollary 5 and Section 4). The expression for the density $f_{RR\mathbf{W}}$ of the radial variable of a Gaussian scale mixture distribution is obtained

as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{RR_W}(r) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \int_0^\infty F(r/s) f_{R_W}(s) \, ds = \int_0^\infty F(1/s) \frac{\partial}{\partial r} f_{R_W}(rs) r \, ds \\ &= \int_0^\infty F(1/s) \{f_{R_W}(rs) + f'_{R_W}(rs) rs\} \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

The density of R conditional to $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ is based on the change of variables from $(r, \mathbf{w})$ to $(r, \mathbf{x}) = (r, r\mathbf{w})$ in $f_{R, \mathbf{W}} = f \times \varphi_D(\cdot; \Sigma)$:

$$f_{R, \mathbf{X}}(r, \mathbf{x}) = f(r) \times \varphi_D(\mathbf{x}/r; \Sigma) \times r^{-D}.$$

The formula $f_{R|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}(r) = f_{R, \mathbf{X}}(r, \mathbf{x})/f_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})$ yields the conditional density.

□

Proof of Theorem 2.

The bivariate standard Gaussian vector $\mathbf{W} = (W_1, W_2)^T$ has elliptic representation $R_W(U_1, \rho U_1 + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} U_2)^T$ with $R_W \perp (U_1, U_2)^T$ and $(U_1, U_2)^T$ distributed uniformly on the unit circle. In the following, parameter and variable subscripts, such as R_W and α_W , always refer to the vector $\mathbf{W}$. Since $R_W^2 \sim \chi_2^2 = \Gamma_{\beta=1}(a=1, b=2)$ is gamma distributed, we transform the gamma tail decay rate from Lemma 1 in the Supplementary Materials to obtain

$$\Pr(R_W > r) = \Pr(R_W^2 > r^2) \sim (r/2)^{1-1} \{\Gamma(1)\}^{-1} \exp(-r^2/2) = \exp(-r^2/2), \quad r \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore, R_W has Weibull-type tail as in (11) with parameters $\alpha_W = 1$, $\beta_W = 2$, $\gamma_W = 0$, $\delta_W = 1/2$ in obvious notation. We write $\mathbf{X} = R\mathbf{W} = R^*(U_1, \rho U_1 + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} U_2)^T$ with $R^* = RR_W$ a product of two independent Weibull-type variables. The tail expansion for such products, given in Lemma 6, yields a Weibull-type tail as in (11) for R^* . Setting $R_1 = R$ and $R_2 = R_W$ in Lemma 6, the constant in (24) is $A = \{(\beta\delta)/(2 \times 1/2)\}^{1/(\beta+2)} = (\beta\delta)^{1/(2+\beta)}$ and

$$\Pr(R^* > r) \sim \alpha^* r^{\gamma^*} \exp(-\delta^* r^{\beta^*}), \quad r \rightarrow \infty,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha^* &= \left(\frac{2\pi\beta_W\delta_W}{\beta_W + \beta} \right)^{1/2} A^{\beta_W/2+\gamma_W-\gamma} \alpha \alpha_W = \left(\frac{2\pi}{2+\beta} \right)^{1/2} A^{1-\gamma} \alpha, \\
\beta^* &= 2\beta/(2+\beta), \\
\gamma^* &= \frac{2\gamma + \beta}{2+\beta}, \\
\delta^* &= \delta^{1-\beta/(\beta_W+\beta)} \delta_W^{\beta/(\beta_W+\beta)} \left\{ (\beta_W/\beta)^{\beta/(\beta_W+\beta)} + (\beta/\beta_W)^{1-\beta/(\beta_W+\beta)} \right\} \\
&= \delta^{2/(2+\beta)} 2^{-\beta/(2+\beta)} \left\{ (2/\beta)^{\beta/(2+\beta)} + (\beta/2)^{2/(2+\beta)} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We derive $\bar{\chi}$ using Lemma 5. The weight function of R^* in (21) is $w^*(u) = \delta^* \beta^* u^{\beta^*-1}$. Lemma 5 yields the coefficient of tail dependence of $\mathbf{X}$ given as $\eta = \{(1+\rho)/2\}^{\beta/(2+\beta)}$. We obtain $\bar{\chi} = 2(\eta - 1) = 2\{(1+\rho)/2\}^{\beta/(2+\beta)} - 1$.

Lemma 5 helps to derive the joint tail representation (12). By combining (22) and (23) (with $x_1 = x_2 = 1$) and substituting R in Lemma 5 by R^* (with its tail parameters $\alpha^*, \beta^*, \gamma^*, \delta^*$), we obtain that $\bar{C}(1 - 1/x, 1 - 1/x) \sim \bar{C}(1 - 1/x, 1 - 1/x) = K (\log x)^{(1-1/\eta)\gamma^*/\beta^*+1/(2\eta)-1} x^{-1/\eta}$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, with constant term

$$K = (\alpha^*)^{-1} (1-\rho)^{-2} \{2/(1+\rho)\}^{\gamma^*/2-\beta^*/2+1} (1-\rho^2)^{3/2} (\delta^*)^{(1/\eta-1)\gamma^*/\beta^*} \{(\alpha^*)^2/(2\pi\beta^*)\}^{1-1/(2\eta)},$$

which proves (12). Finally, $\chi = 0$ follows from $\bar{\chi} < 1$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3. Since R is regularly varying with index γ and R_W is light-tailed, Breiman's Lemma 8 proves that $R^* = RR_W$ is regularly varying with index γ . Hence, the limiting max-stable dependence structure is the extremal- t dependence and the expression for χ and the joint tail representation (15) are standard results (Opitz, 2013). $\square$

References

- Arendarczyk, M. and Debicki, K. (2011) Asymptotics of supremum distribution of a gaussian process over a weibullian time. *Bernoulli* **17**(1), 194–210.
- Berman, S. (1992) *Sojourns and extremes of stochastic processes*. CRC Press.

- Breiman, L. (1965) On some limit theorems similar to the arc-sin law. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* **10**(2), 323–331.
- Cambanis, S., Huang, S. and Simons, G. (1981) On the theory of elliptically contoured distributions. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **11**(3), 368–385.
- Castruccio, S., Huser, R. and Genton, M. G. (2016) High-order Composite Likelihood Inference for Max-Stable Distributions and Processes. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics, To appear*.
- Coles, S. G., Heffernan, J. and Tawn, J. A. (1999) Dependence Measures for Extreme Value Analyses. *Extremes* **2**(4), 339–365.
- Coles, S. G. and Pauli, F. (2002) Models and inference for uncertainty in extremal dependence. *Biometrika* **89**(1), 183–196.
- Davison, A. C., Huser, R. and Thibaud, E. (2013) Geostatistics of Dependent and Asymptotically Independent Extremes. *Mathematical Geosciences* **45**(5), 511–529.
- de Haan, L. and Ferreira, A. (2006) *Extreme Value Theory: An Introduction*. New York, USA: Springer. ISBN 9780387344713.
- Demarta, S. and McNeil, A. J. (2005) The t copula and related copulas. *International Statistical Review* **73**(1), 111–129.
- Dombry, C., Genton, M. G., Huser, R. and Ribatet, M. (2016) Full likelihood inference for max-stable data. Submitted.
- Einmahl, J. H., Kiriliouk, A., Krajina, A. and Segers, J. (2016) An M-estimator of spatial tail dependence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **78**, 275–298.
- Engelke, S., Malinowski, A., Kabluchko, Z. and Schlather, M. (2015) Estimation of Hüsler–Reiss distributions and Brown–Resnick processes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **77**(1), 239–265.

- Ferreira, A. and de Haan, L. (2014) The generalized Pareto process; with a view towards application and simulation. *Bernoulli* **20**(4), 1717–1737.
- Forbes, C., Evans, M., Hastings, N. and Peacock, B. (2011) *Statistical distributions*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Fuentes, M., Henry, J. and Reich, B. (2013) Nonparametric spatial models for extremes: application to extreme temperature data. *Extremes* **16**(1), 75–101.
- Genest, C., Ghouli, K. and Rivest, L.-P. (1995) A semiparametric estimation procedure of dependence parameters in multivariate families of distributions. *Biometrika* **82**, 543–552.
- Genz, A. and Bretz, F. (2009) *Computation of Multivariate Normal and t Probabilities*. New York, USA: Springer. ISBN 9783642016899.
- Hashorva, E. (2006) On the multivariate Hüsler–Reiss distribution attracting the maxima of elliptical triangular arrays. *Statistics & probability letters* **76**(18), 2027–2035.
- Hashorva, E. (2010) On the residual dependence index of elliptical distributions. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **80**(13), 1070–1078.
- Hashorva, E. (2013) Minima and maxima of elliptical arrays and spherical processes. *Bernoulli* **19**(3), 886–904.
- Hashorva, E. and Pakes, A. G. (2010) Tail asymptotics under beta random scaling. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **372**(2), 496–514.
- Huang, S. T. and Cambanis, S. (1979) Spherically invariant processes: Their nonlinear structure, discrimination, and estimation. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **9**(1), 59–83.
- Huser, R. and Davison, A. C. (2013) Composite likelihood estimation for the Brown–Resnick process. *Biometrika* **100**(2), 511–518.

- Huser, R. and Davison, A. C. (2014) Space-time modelling of extreme events. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **76**(2), 439–461.
- Huser, R., Davison, A. C. and Genton, M. G. (2016) Likelihood estimators for multivariate extremes. *Extremes* **19**(1), 79–103.
- Huser, R. and Genton, M. G. (2016) Non-stationary dependence structures for spatial extremes. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological and Environmental Statistics* **21**(3), 470–491.
- Hüsler, J. and Reiss, R.-D. (1989) Maxima of normal random vectors: Between independence and complete dependence. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **7**(4), 283–286.
- Kabluchko, Z., Schlather, M. and De Haan, L. (2009) Stationary max-stable fields associated to negative definite functions. *The Annals of Probability* **37**, 2042–2065.
- Kaufmann, E. (2000) Penultimate approximations in extreme value theory. *Extremes* **3**(1), 39–55.
- Kazor, K. and Hering, A. S. (2015) The role of regimes in short-term wind speed forecasting at multiple wind farms. *Stat* **4**(1), 271–290.
- Krupskii, P., Huser, R. and Genton, M. G. (2016) Factor Copula Models for Replicated Spatial Data. Submitted.
- Ledford, A. W. and Tawn, J. A. (1996) Statistics for near independence in multivariate extreme values. *Biometrika* **83**(1), 169–187.
- Morris, S. A., Reich, B. J., Thibaud, E. and Cooley, D. (2015) A space-time skew-t model for threshold exceedances. Submitted.
- Opitz, T. (2013) Extremal t processes: Elliptical domain of attraction and a spectral representation. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **122**, 409–413.

- Opitz, T. (2016) Modeling asymptotically independent spatial extremes based on Laplace random fields. *Spatial Statistics* **16**, 1–18.
- Padoan, S. A., Ribatet, M. and Sisson, S. A. (2010) Likelihood-based inference for max-stable processes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **105**, 263–277.
- Røislien, J. and Omre, H. (2006) T-distributed random fields: A parametric model for heavy-tailed well log data. *Mathematical Geology* **38**(7), 821–849.
- Sklar, A. (1959) Fonctions de répartition à n dimensions et leurs marges. *Publications de l'Institut de Statistique de l'Université de Paris* **8**, 229–231.
- Thibaud, E., Aalto, J., Cooley, D. S., Davison, A. C. and Heikkinen, J. (2016) Bayesian inference for the Brown–Resnick process, with an application to extreme low temperatures. *Annals of Applied Statistics* To appear.
- Thibaud, E., Mutzner, R. and Davison, A. C. (2013) Threshold modeling of extreme spatial rainfall. *Water Resources Research* **49**(8), 4633–4644.
- Thibaud, E. and Opitz, T. (2015) Efficient inference and simulation for elliptical Pareto processes. *Biometrika* **102**(4), 855–870.
- Wadsworth, J. L. and Tawn, J. A. (2012) Dependence modelling for spatial extremes. *Biometrika* **99**(2), 253–272.
- Wadsworth, J. L. and Tawn, J. A. (2014) Efficient inference for spatial extreme value processes associated to log-Gaussian random functions. *Biometrika* **101**(1), 1–15.
- Wang, J. and Genton, M. G. (2006) The multivariate skew-slash distribution. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **136**(1), 209–220.